

REMARKS

Claims 1-19 remain pending in the application. Claims 1-19 stand rejected by the examiner. Applicant traverses the rejections of claims 1-19.

Claim Rejections - § § 102 and 103

Claims 1, 3, 5-12 and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by the examiner's prior art screenshots of Microsoft Outlook 2000 hereinafter "Outlook." Claims 2, 4 and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Outlook and Arcuri et al. (US Patent No. 6,133,915 hereinafter "Arcuri"). Claims 13 and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Outlook and Torres (US Patent No. 5,317,687 hereinafter "Torres"). Claims 16 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Outlook. Applicant traverses the rejections.

Claim 1 recites a method for modifying data records from a database by a user within a graphical user interface. A first control is manipulated to access a second control which includes the data records. As required by claim 1 in combination with its other limitations, the second control is configured to be displayed and to operate within the first control. As an example, figure 2 of applicant's patent application shows a second control 224 being displayed and operating within a first control 210.

The office action asserts on page 2 that for claim 1, Outlook teaches that the second control is configured to operate within the first control "wherein the second control is presented to the user in the large right panel of Fig. 1". Applicant respectfully disagrees with this position.

Assuming *arguendo* that controls are being disclosed in the Outlook reference, the asserted second control of the Outlook reference is not displayed and does not operate within a first control as required by claim 1 in combination with its other limitations. Instead, the asserted second control of the Outlook reference “is presented to the user in the large right panel of Fig. 1” as mentioned in the office action on page 2. The large right panel region which contains the asserted second control is not being displayed within the asserted first control of Outlook and thus is not being displayed within nor being operated within a first control as required by claim 1.

Stated otherwise, the asserted first control (e.g., an icon shown in the “Folder List” portion of Fig. 1 of the Outlook reference as maintained by the office action on page 2) is shown in the far left panel of Fig. 1 of the Outlook reference. The asserted second control of the Outlook reference “is presented to the user in the large right panel of Fig. 1” of the Outlook reference. The asserted second control from the large right panel is not displayed within nor does it operate within the asserted first control of Outlook which is displayed on the other side of the Outlook window.

The asserted controls of the Outlook reference are strewn across the Outlook interface. This is in stark contrast to claim 1’s approach which in combination with its other limitations recites that the second control is configured to be displayed and to operate within the first control. This approach of claim 1 allows valuable interface “real estate” to be conserved. This is useful, for example, to interface developers who typically must address limited display space requirements because of the size of computer screens (e.g., PDAs and laptops). With the approach of claim 1, interface area is significantly better utilized.

Because of such differences between claim 1 and the Outlook reference, claim 1 is allowable over the Outlook reference. Accordingly, claim 1 and its dependent claims should proceed to issuance.

Applicant disagrees with other positions in the office action. For example, claim 2 is rejected as being unpatentable over Outlook and Arcuri. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Claim 2 recites in combination with its other limitations that the second control includes separate checkbox interface items that are associated with each of the displayed data records. Claim 2 has been amended to recite that the data records selected through their associated checkbox interface items are used as data by a software application. Accordingly, claim 2 is directed to data records for manipulation (e.g., for modification as recited in the preamble of claim 1) by a software application.

In contrast, the Arcuri reference does not disclose controls containing data records which are selected for use as data by a software application, but rather discloses software menu item operations appearing in menus (see the “New” menu item operation 244, the “Open” menu item operation 246, etc. on FIG. 2b of the Arcuri reference). Such menu item operations are not used as data by a software application. Rather, software menu item operations are the agent of change to be effected upon data records, and the data records are the recipient of the change caused by software operations. This is illustrated in that the menu items in Arcuri cannot themselves be modified. They can only be selected or deselected. The functionality of the menu items has already been predetermined. It cannot be altered. Because of the significantly different natures of menu item operations and data records that are selected to be used as data by a software

application, claim 2 is allowable over Outlook and Arcuri. Accordingly, claim 2 should proceed to issuance.

Claim 12 recites a graphical user interface for modifying data records by a user. Claim 12 recites in combination with its other limitations that a second control is configured to be displayed and to operate within the first control. Because the Outlook reference does not disclose such limitations, claim 12 and its dependent claims are allowable over the Outlook reference and should proceed to issuance.

Claim 17 recites an apparatus for generating a graphical user interface. Claim 17 recites in combination with its other limitations that a second control is displayed within the first control. Because the Outlook reference does not disclose such limitations, claim 17 and its dependent claims are allowable over the Outlook reference and should proceed to issuance.

[CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE]

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-19 are allowable. Therefore, the examiner is respectfully requested to pass this case to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 5, 2005

By: John V. Biernacki
John V. Biernacki
Reg. No. 40,511
JONES DAY
North Point
901 Lakeside Avenue
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
(216) 586-3939